



Respectfully Submitted



David Fichtenberg

Spokesperson for the Ad-Hoc Association of Parties Concerned About the Federal  
Communications Commission's Radiofrequency Health and Safety Rules et al  
and acting as a member of and in behalf of the Washington Council for Safe Wireless  
Technology

Verification: I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed  
on Sept 21, 1997 (date)



David Fichtenberg  
Washington Council For Safe Wireless Technology  
Ad-Hoc Association of Parties Concerned About the Federal Communications Commission's  
Radiofrequency Health and Safety Rules  
PO Box 7577]  
Olympia, Washington 90507-7577

(206) 722-8306

# EXHIBIT 1

## Some Members of the Rainer Valley Association For Safe Wireless Technology

1. David Fichtenberg, 4825 South Graham Street, Seattle, WA 98118
2. Milton A. Cooper II, 4228 S. Juneau, Seattle, WA 98118
3. Tony Phelps, 4200 South Juneau Street, Seattle, WA 98118
4. Kenneth Oakman, 4222 South Juneau Street, Seattle, WA 98118
5. Linda D. Scheck, 4203 South Findlay Street, Seattle, WA 98118
6. Betty Ellis, 4223 South Findlay Street, Seattle, WA 98118
7. Dennis M. Flemming, 4222 South Findlay Street, Seattle, WA 98118
8. Samuel H. Langi, 4229 South Findlay Street, Seattle, WA 98118
9. Greg Stumph, 4240 South Findlay Street, Seattle, WA 98118
10. Christina Miller, 4234 South Findlay Street, Seattle WA 98118
11. Robert E. Gruber, Jr. 4214 South Findlay Street, Seattle, 98118
12. Barbara Martin, 4214 South Findlay Street, Seattle, WA 98118
13. Amber Dawn Herbert, 4209 South Findlay Street, WA 98118
14. Betty Faye Muelles-Herbert, 4209 South Findlay Street, WA 98118
15. Patrick D. Herbert, 4209 South Findlay Street, 98118
16. Ruby Grobe, 4200 South Orcas Street, Seattle, WA 98118
17. Lucy T. dela Cruz, 4218 S. Orcas Street, Seattle, WA 98118
18. Jerry Johnson, 5933 48th Avenue South, Seattle, WA 98118
19. Stephanie Ragland, 5933 48th Avenue South, Seattle, WA 98118



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OCT 8 1996

OFFICE OF  
AIR AND RADIATION

David Fichtenberg  
P.O. Box 7577  
Olympia, WA 98507-7577

Dear Mr. Fichtenberg:

Thank you for your E-mail letter of October 2, 1996, that asks for clarification of a statement in the letter (July 25, 1996) from Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Carol M. Browner to Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Reed E. Hundt. You request explanation of the statement, "this new approach is consistent with our comments made in 1993 and addresses our concerns about adequate protection of public health," with questions that pertain to acute thermal exposures, long-term (chronic) nonthermal exposures, and specific absorption rate (SAR).

The aforementioned letter was a response to a Mr. Hundt's request (July 1, 1996) that EPA review the FCC's approach to developing new guidelines. The EPA discussion of the original FCC Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, "Guidelines for Evaluating the Environmental Effects of Radio frequency (RF) Radiation, ET Docket No. 93-62," resulted in recommendations to the FCC (November 9, 1993). One of those recommendations was that the FCC adopt the exposure criteria recommended by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP) in NCRP Report No. 86, "Biological Effects and Exposure Criteria for Radio frequency Electromagnetic Fields," instead of the 1992 ANSI/IEEE standard that was originally proposed.

The FCC concluded its rule-making activity in August 1996, and adopted RF radiation exposure limits that are generally based on the NCRP guidelines as was recommended by EPA. In addition the FCC specified (in the introduction to its Report and Order FCC 96-326) that the maximum permissible exposure limits adopted are based on exposure criteria quantified in terms of specific absorption rate, and that the SAR limit is 4 watts per kilogram (W/kg).

EPA was very specific in our 1993 comments regarding the sufficiency of available information (on the health effects of RF radiation) to provide a basis for developing exposure standards. In the context of those comments, the FCC's resulting rule that generally followed the NCRP guidelines, and the FCC's explicit statement that the limits adopted are based on the SAR limit of 4 W/kg, EPA believes that our concerns about adequate protection of public health were addressed by the FCC. The FCC does not claim that their new exposure guidelines provide protection for effects to which the 4W/kg SAR basis does not apply.

A key conclusion of EPA's Radio frequency Radiation Conference, April 1993 (see "Summary and Results of the April 26-27, 1993, Radio frequency Radiation Conference," Vol. 1: Analysis of Panel Discussions, EPA Report 402-R-95-009, March 1995) is that "There is sufficient information on thermal exposure/effects on which to base a standard. However, participants generally felt that more information needs to be obtained on nonthermal effects." This is reflected in EPA's November 1993 comments to the FCC. These include the following:

"While studies continue to be published describing biological responses to nonthermal ELF-modulated RF radiation, the effects information is not yet sufficient to be used as a basis for exposure criteria to protect the public against adverse human health effects."

"It is clear that the adverse effect threshold of 4 W/kg is based on acute exposures (measured in minutes or a few hours) that elevate temperature in laboratory animals including nonhuman primates, and not on long-term, low-level (non-thermal) exposure. Only a few chronic exposure studies of laboratory animals and epidemiological studies of human populations have been reported. The majority of these relatively few studies indicate no significant health effects are associated with chronic, low-level exposure to RF radiation. This conclusion is tempered by the results of a small number of reports suggesting potentially adverse health effects (cancer) may exist (...).

"The thesis that the 1992 ANSI/IEEE recommendations are protective of all mechanisms of interaction is unwarranted because the adverse effects level in the 1992 ANSI/IEEE standard is based on a thermal effect."

"While there is general, although not unanimous, agreement that the data base on low-level, long-term is insufficient to provide a basis for standards development, some contemporary guidelines state explicitly that their adverse-effect level is based on an increase in body temperature (NRPB 1993). Furthermore they do not claim that the exposure limits protect against both thermal and nonthermal effects."


With this background established, I will proceed to provide my responses to your other questions.

- Q. Is it correct to conclude that the "adequate protection of public health" noted above, refers to "protecting against thermally related effects in humans?"
- A. As I have previously noted, while there is sufficient information on thermal exposure/effects on which to base a standard, the data base on low-level, long-term exposure is insufficient to provide a basis for standards to protect the public against adverse human health effects that may result from long-term, nonthermal exposures. Both the NCRP and ANSI/IEEE standards are thermally based, and do not apply to chronic, nonthermal exposure situations. The statement referring to "adequate protection" pertains to thermally related effects.

- Q. Is it still correct that adverse effect level of 4 W/kg is based on acute exposures that elevate temperature in laboratory animals including nonhuman primates, and not on long-term, low-level (non-thermal) exposure.
- A. Yes
- Q. Is it correct that the "adequate protection" EPA refers to in its July 25, 1996 letter pertains to protection provided for the effects which occurred due acute exposures, and not necessarily to effects reported to occur below the 4W/kg threshold level?
- A. We are referring to exposures that are acute, thermal exposures, not non-thermal, chronic exposures. The SAR limit to which the whole-body exposure limits for the public are related is 0.08 W/kg due to the use of a factor of 50 uncertainty factor applied to the 4 W/kg basis.
- Q. Is it correct that "adequate protection" of public health pertains to thermally related health effects, and not necessarily to the nonthermal effects noted in the 1993 EPA letter?
- A. Yes
- Q. In view of 1993 comments, does adequate protection pertain to microwave hearing?
- A. In that the 'microwave hearing effect' has not been established as a health effect, our statement with regard to "adequate protection" would not pertain to microwave hearing.

I hope that this information has been helpful and responsive to your inquiry. Please contact me if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,



Norbert N. Hankin (6604J)  
Indoor Environments Division  
Office of Radiation and Indoor Air  
Environmental Protection Agency  
Washington, D.C. 20460  
Tel: (202) 233-9235  
Fax: (202) 233-9650